

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of November 13, 2007, claims 1-5 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5 are amended and claim 2 is cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0001026) (“*Ishikawa*”) in view of *Hidejiro* (JP 2000-289320) (“*Hidejiro*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 now recites:

“forming at least one of said organic layers by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a gravure roll whose edges are tapered in the axial direction at both ends such that a coating film comprised of the coating liquid is provided on a surface of the silicone blanket with substantially the same thickness throughout a pixel-forming-area.”

As the Examiner states in the Office Action of November 13, 2007, *Ishikawa* and *Hidejiro* fail to disclose the use of a gravure roll tapered in the axial direction at both ends. It is through use of such a roll that the coating film is provided with uniform thickness.

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Hidejiro* and any combination of the two fail to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 1, the rejection cannot stand.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0001026) (“*Ishikawa*”) in view of *Hidejiro* (JP 2000-289320)

(“*Hidejiro*”) and in further view of *Johnson* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,540,147) (“*Johnson*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 2 is cancelled as part of the current amendment. Therefore, the rejection is moot as to claim 2. With this amendment, the limitations of claim 2 are added to claim 1.

As stated above, in relevant part, independent claim 1 now recites:

“forming at least one of said organic layers by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a gravure roll whose edges are tapered in the axial direction at both ends such that a coating film comprised of the coating liquid is provided on a surface of the silicone blanket with substantially the same thickness throughout a pixel-forming-area.”

As stated above, *Ishikawa* and *Hidejiro* fail to disclose a gravure roll tapered in the axial direction at both ends.

Johnson, similarly, fails to disclose a gravure roll tapered in the axial direction at both ends. Instead, *Johnson* discloses a layer 14 formed on the circumference of a cylinder 16 with the sides 72 of the layer tapered in a radial direction. See, U.S. Pat. No. 5,540,147, Col. 7, l. 24-41.

As the Applicant’s current specification discloses, by providing a gravure roll with both ends tapered in the axial direction the coating is applied to the silicone blanket with uniform thickness resulting in enhanced uniformity of light emission from the electroluminescence display. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0202778, Para. [0051]. Since the collector roll of *Johnson* is not tapered at both ends in the axial direction, it cannot produce this desired effect.

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Hidejiro*, *Johnson* and any combination of the them fail to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 1, the rejection cannot stand.

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0001026) (“*Ishikawa*”) in view of *Hidejiro* (JP 2000-289320) (“*Hidejiro*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 3 now recites:

“said top faces of said two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of said silicone blanket.”

This is clearly unlike *Ishikawa*, which fails to disclose the top faces of two flat plates being slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of a silicone blanket. Instead, *Ishikawa* discloses a die coater with a flat top end. See, JP 2000-289320 Para. [0013]; Fig 2(b).

As the Applicant’s current specification discloses, by slanting the top faces of two flat plates with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of a silicone blanket, the coating is applied to the silicone blanket with uniform thickness resulting in enhanced uniformity of light emission from the electroluminescence display. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0202778, Para. [0075]. Since the die coater of *Ishikawa* is not slanted with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion side, it cannot produce this desired effect.

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Hidejiro* and any combination of the two fail to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claims 3, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 4 and 5

depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 3, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 11, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000